

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 176 662

BF 011 771

AUTHOR Lepchenske, George L.
TITLE Educational Cooperation: An Examination of Fourteen Consortia.
PUB DATE Apr 76
NOTE 25p.
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; *College Administration; *Consortia; Cooperative Planning; *Cooperative Programs; Financial Needs; Higher Education; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; Postsecondary Education; Shared Facilities; *Shared Services; Surveys

ABSTRACT

The development of consortia and cooperative educational services in higher education in response to financial pressures and social and governmental influences is examined. Consortia or cooperatives may be multi-channeled efforts, with each member struggling to advance its own self-interest at the cost of united goals and efforts, or thriving cooperative ventures in higher educational management. The successful consortia are buttressed by individual member support, effective leadership, and sound financial backing. A random sample of 27 consortia were contacted by mail and asked to provide information about motivation formation, services shared, administrative organization, and an informal evaluation of the effectiveness of the operation. Responses received from 14 of the consortia indicated that funding comes from many sources in addition to contributions of member institutions and assessments made on program participants. In many cases, consortia were able to get grants on the basis of pooled resources that were not available to the smaller member units. Analysis of the purpose or goal statements of the 14 consortia indicated that the prime concerns were to improve the quality of programs, to save money, to serve the community, and to expand educational opportunities. In all cases, some form of shared services included facilities and/or staff. High-cost, low enrollment programs were the most common joint curricular ventures. By combining resources, consortia are able to respond effectively to community needs. (SC)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED176662

HE

406 28 1979

EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION:
AN EXAMINATION OF FOURTEEN CONSORTIA

By
George L. Lepchenske, Ed.D.
Assistant Campus Dean

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

George L.
Lepchenske

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Mohave Community College
Lake Havasu City, Arizona

April 1976

HE OH 771

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction	1
II. Development of Interinstitutional Cooperation.	2
III. Consortia Funding.	5
IV. Facilities and Faculty Development	8
V. High Cost - Low Enrollment Programs.	11
VI. Socially Responsive Community Activities	12
VII. Regional and Area Planning	14
VIII. Conclusion	17
Appendix A: Study Sample.	18
Selected Bibliography.	19

I. INTRODUCTION

The economic recession in American higher education and changing social demands on educational institutions have generated an administrative technique for expanding financing, curriculum offerings, facilities, and services. This technique is often identified by the misnomer of "consortia" or "cooperative education services." A cooperative or consortium is often just exactly the opposite--an active struggle among members to advance their own self-interest at the cost of united goals and efforts. The consortia included in this study reflect these multi-channeled efforts while also examining the more successful efforts of thriving cooperative ventures in higher education management. The successful consortia are buttressed by individual member support, effective leadership, and sound financial backing. The activities resulting from these successes in cooperative operations will be examined for common traits and characteristics.

The sample for this consortia study was selected from the 1973 Consortium Directory compiled by Lewis D. Patterson for the American Association for Higher Education. Random selection of twenty-seven consortia from the eighty listings was achieved by the use of a table of random numbers. Each unit of the sample was contacted by mail, and asked to provide information about motivation for formation, services shared, administrative organization, and an informal evaluation of effectiveness of the operation. This request provided usable responses from fourteen organizations. (See Appendix A for organizations included in the study.) Of the fourteen usable responses, twelve gave expansive and complete information; one reply indicated only a brief survey of institutions included in the membership; one sent a letter enumerating general references only.

From the information gathered and examined, several inferences may be drawn:

1. Funding for consortia comes from sources in addition to contributions of member institutions.

2. Shared facilities and faculty development activities are intrinsic to cooperative programs.
3. High cost and low enrollment programs are the most common curricular ventures.
4. Socially responsive community activities and involvement are areas of consortia interest.
5. Area or regional planning and development are components of cooperative action.

These assumptions are supported only by the information provided by a fifteen percent (15%) sample of the population; therefore, can only be considered as indicators for further and more intense inquiry.

II. DEVELOPMENT OF INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

Recent developments have forced individual institutions to reexamine some of the concepts of historic institutional autonomy and prestige. The economic pressures of rapid growth and reduced public support are providing the impetus for changes in the public sector of higher education. The private colleges are further prodded by increased costs, the demand for relevant education, and social changes. Complex technology and rapid increases in knowledge have created a need for varied instructional techniques and strategies requiring vast expenditures for support facilities and faculty development. Many institutions have turned to cooperative agreements to achieve these needs.

Moore reported over 1,017 consortia with over 1,500 institutions in his 1967 study of interinstitutional cooperation. These institutions' efforts were divided into four broad groups: (1) students, (2) staff, (3) facilities, and (4) programs and services. Participation in student exchanges accounted for about fifty percent (50%) of the cooperative programs while the remainder was equally divided among the other three categories. This concern for student recruitment was a pseudo-attempt to directly equate bodies with dollars (McGrath, 1967, pp. 20-22; Cheit, 1971, pp. 1-20). This attitude was a self-defeating one,

generating new problems for all institutions in the form of increased need for capital expenditures and further expansion while costs continued to increase.

In 1965 the United States Congress endorsed interinstitutional cooperation as a technique for solving some of the problems of higher education. Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-329) gave support for cooperative arrangements among developing institutions. Colleges evaluated as "struggling for survival" and "isolated from the main currents of academia" would benefit from Title III funds. Quite a few consortia resulted from these efforts.

Franklin Patterson views the influence of national and state governments as inevitable. He questions only if the reorganization of higher education will occur by joint planning and collaboration among institutions, or involuntary coordination, directed by states and the national government (Colleges in Consort, p. 8; The New Depression, p. 103). Many authorities anticipate operational restrictions and controls from some external sources in the near future. The only area of debate is from what direction and to what extent will these restrictions materialize (Orwig, pp. 177-281; Cheit, pp. 103-118; Carnegie Commission, Higher Education, pp. 29-34). The most common conclusions seem to indicate a need for more effective organization and accounting (Carnegie Commission, Higher Education, pp. 131-163), more effective utilization of educational resources (Orwig, p. 22; Schwenkmeyer, pp. 1-2; Cheit, pp. 17-20), expand sources of funds for operation and student aid (O'Neill, pp. 49-54; AAHE, pp. 39-42), and respond with meaningful programs to fill social needs (Harclerod, pp. 87-91; Dressel, pp. 257-284; Mayhew, pp. 71-85). From the growth of consortia operations during the past 8-10 years, the answer would seem to be interinstitutional cooperation.

A result of these funding sources was an influx of new consortia during 1967. Two examples of new cooperatives would be the Dayton-Miami Valley Consortium

and the Central Pennsylvania Consortium. Both organized in 1967. The Dayton-Miami Valley Consortium includes two state universities, a public community college, six private church-related institutions, a federal installation, a proprietary art school, and a career training school with a combined enrollment of over 30,000 students (DMVC, Student Cross-Registration Policy and Procedures, 1975). In addition, the DMVC operates an Educational Opportunity Center funded by federal, state, and local monies through grants to the consortium. These funds also support various vocational programs in all member institutions in a form of federal support of private and proprietary schools (DMVC, Constitution, p. 2; Orwig, pp. 219-267).

The Central Pennsylvania Consortium consists of four private liberal arts institutions enrolling about 5,800 students. The total endorsement funds equal approximately \$32,000,000. CPC was organized in July 1968 to "strengthen and broaden existing programs, and to offer a number of worthwhile cooperative programs that could not be undertaken by a single institution" (CPC, The CPC, p. 2). Funding for the consortium development originated from the Danforth Foundation in conjunction with federal program monies. By 1969-70, two programs were in operation: the Summer India Institute and the Transition Program for Differently Prepared Students. These programs served the liberal arts concept by providing cultural educational activities to students and public service to society by widening access to higher education for the remedial and culturally different student, thereby satisfying the requirements of both interest areas of fund suppliers. In 1973-74, the offerings of CPC numbered twenty-five. The programs included administrative cost reducing features of cross-registration and joint use of facilities, shared admissions procedures, recruitment programs, cooperative fund-raising, and faculty development activities (CPC, The CPC, p. 7). These two cooperative programs illustrate the wide diversity of the consortia in operation and the wide range of influences and activities they represent

as a result of the financial pressures developed during the 1960's and continuing into the 1970's.

Moore's study listed 637 bilateral arrangements, 596 agreements without independent budget, and many other arrangements (1968). This study gave an indication of the direction and types of institutions involved in consortia.

Lewis D. Patterson developed a more selective listing of consortia memberships. In 1967, thirty-one consortia were named as meeting the criteria: (1) voluntary formal organization, (2) three or more member institutions, (3) multiacademic programs, (4) at least one full-time professional for administration, and (5) a required annual contribution or long-term financial commitment (1973, p. 1). By 1974, the list meeting these criteria had grown to 103 consortia (1974). The relative speed of increased interest and activity is significant when it is observed that over half of the cooperative ventures have been organized since 1970.

Franklin Patterson supports the arguments for strong interinstitutional cooperation, but observes that "the movement at this point is unsubstantial and shaky" (1974, p. 9). He further questions the promise of a complete "cure-all" for effective administration and the practicality of operations of consortia. These questions will be expanded during the remainder of this paper.

III. CONSORTIA FUNDING

Finances for consortia operations generally come from member contributions and assessments made upon program participants. During the course of this study, an observation was made that this was not the way in which the majority of programs operated. Most charters, bylaws, or articles of incorporation indicated the consortium would receive funds from sources other than member institutions. In cases where information was available, these sources were governmental and private in nature. From the types of programs cooperatively operated,

an argument can be developed that consortia are sources of monetary aid to higher education outside the traditional definition.

Drucker observed that grants were a significant part of the financial base of many institutions, but most grants were awarded to larger universities because of the vast resources of talent and facilities available. It is much more convenient for a donor to sign one large contract than to negotiate several smaller ones with a number of small colleges. A larger contract reduces the amount of clerical and administrative work (Letter, pp. 12-14). A cooperative agreement among several smaller institutions would effectively place the group in a competitive position with larger universities for grants in program development and research. John Van Valkenburg, Huntington College, has developed a technique for cooperative fund development. Critical to the process is a master plan for the ultimate goals of the cooperative. Each project must support the overall goals and philosophy of the group (Diener, p. 17). These projects can then serve as integral parts of the program of each individual institution, expanding the educational opportunities for the student body.

An interesting case in point is the Consortium for Continuing Higher Education in Northern Virginia. This organization of institutions receives funds directly from the state government for programs offered in conjunction with member institutions. The consortium provides an advertising service for members in addition to attempting to provide full information about continuing education offerings to the community and continuing education needs to member institutions. Funding for specific programs originates in several sources. Vocational and special skills education projects are funded by federal sources. Several individual projects have received state monies for initial planning and development. Social service and research activities are financed by various combinations of federal, state, foundation, and member contributions. Each project or offering uses shared resources resulting in mutual acceptance and interchangeability of course credits among member schools, reducing duplication of

administrative and curricular efforts, and therefore increasing opportunities for adults to earn degrees (1972, p. 5-7).

A more complex and diverse example of funding sources would be the Dayton-Miami Valley Consortium which includes all elements of post-secondary education. DMVC has received grants from the Office of Education, Office of Educational Opportunity, Kettering Foundation, Ohio Board of Regents, City of Dayton Model Cities, and the Packaging Education Foundation amounting to over \$2,000,000 from 1967 to 1974 (DMVC, Information Sheet, 1974). These funds were utilized for planning, development, and operation of various programs by the consortium which included private church-related schools, a proprietary art school, and a career training school--a drastic reversal of traditional funding patterns for post-secondary education. This reversal was a result of cooperative efforts to provide services to an entire community using the most efficient methods of administration and delivery; thereby benefiting not only the community, but also the individual institutions themselves.

This pattern of external funding is also indirectly indicated as a factor in successful consortia operation. These external funds support specialized programs of a categorical nature of research projects. DMVC obtained one grant to develop a CATV training program for human services. This then removed the financial responsibility for development costs from the individual institutions. Yet, each benefited from the program when it started operations. Millard indicated that the National Commission on the Financing of Post-Secondary Education reported that required planning must be completed before coordination of efforts may be attempted. These external funding sources then insure a clear recognition of role and scope in higher education by requiring extensive preparations (AAHE, 1974, pp. 40-41). With these preliminary costs provided, more efficient operations can then be performed using consortia funds in a much more effective manner. Planning and research funding is then an important element of a successful consortium.

IV. FACILITIES AND FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

An analysis of fourteen consortia purpose or goal statements indicate a prime concern to improve the quality of programs, to save money, to serve the community, and to expand educational opportunities. In all cases, some form of shared services included facilities and/or staff in various forms. Some of the more common were laboratory or library usage, student institutes or experiences, acquisition of resources (scholars in residence, cultural presentations, lecturers, or consultants), and varieties of administrative services. In-service training or faculty development of professional abilities was a common element of most cooperative organizations. The exchange and development of ideas in a variety of disciplines transcends the autonomy of individual institutions while retaining personal meaning for the participants when presented as a joint effort of the consortium.

Cooperative usage of facilities serves dual purposes: (1) it allows an expansion of educational opportunities while (2) saving money. The Associated Colleges of the Midwest (ACM) and the Dayton-Miami Valley Consortium (DMVC) provide opportunities for students to share lab space in both language learning and natural science courses. Implied and directly connected with shared laboratory space is a cross-registration provision allowing students to apply credit from a cooperating institution to a degree program or vocational program at another. Library facility joint usage or usage of library resources is the most popular area of joint ventures. The Alabama Center for Higher Education (ACHE) has developed a specialized collection of references relating to Black culture which is a combined resource for all members of the consortia and a base for program development in the entire State of Alabama for Black cultural studies. ACM provides 24-hour photocopy service for member institutions of 2,000 titles and 48-hour service for another 50,000 titles available from other libraries. The Council for Intercultural Studies and Programs (CISP) provides intercultural

information service for all members of this consortium. This service included a calendar of related meetings, deadlines, and sources of grants and fellowships and a list of current research in the intercultural field. The collection stresses the Asian and mid-Eastern cultures, but also provides information and interlibrary loan services in all cultural areas. Other cooperative agreements provide services as diverse as videotape loans (WCHE), shuttle libraries in special areas of interest (WCHE), and joint acquisitions (ACM). Cooperative facilities use serves all four implied goals of consortia, but expanded services to students and monetary savings to the individual students are the prime considerations.

Elmer West, Executive Director, Consortium of Universities, identified a major area of concern, particularly of small colleges, in an address to the Joint Educational-Industrial-Governmental Science Symposium.

"All higher education is being stretched to the limit of its resources...by an ever-increasing amount of knowledge requiring an ever-increasing number of faculty members...all combined in what is often described as essentially an inefficient operation to begin with, one which seems to be imbued with a necessity for competition for status and for those needed funds, faculty, and facilities." (West, 1970, p. 38)

Interinstitutional cooperation provides an alternative to added faculty. By joint efforts, many consortia are developing programs to expand the capabilities of present faculty members through cooperative faculty development programs.

The Great Lakes Colleges Association (GLCA) has developed a program for faculty development centered around thirty-five (35) fellowships. These fellows attend a spring implementation seminar which identifies and organizes individual and group efforts. At this January seminar, the fellows share ideas about individual projects, identify other individual and institutional interests in improving teaching, and use that information to plan a summer workshop. During the several week-long workshops, the fellows devote their full energies to

teaching and learning issues. During the following academic year, the participants develop, evaluate, and share the knowledge gained with colleagues. A proposed future element is a series of interinstitutional workshops developed from topics from GLCA faculty members (GLCA, Faculty Development, 1975). This approach then contributes to the solution of one of the competitive pressures in higher education--the expansion of knowledge and faculty skills.

One other pressure on institutions for an expanded faculty is to staff specialized programs or programs with limited enrollments. This problem is being addressed by the Academic Affairs Conference of Midwestern Universities. AACMU has several programs which provide interchanges of expertise. Faculty members are exchanged for short-term seminars, internships, and summer teaching assignments, generating a reciprocating of ideas and techniques. Television tape and conference telephone lectures are services of the consortium. The AACMU staffs an Urban Studies Program with members from all five (5) member institutions. Each of three locations provides expertise from a variety of disciplines united for a beneficial real-life learning experience for students (AACMU, p. 4).

Research efforts have become cooperative activities for several large institutions and most smaller ones. GT/70, a consortium of eight community colleges, in association with some thirty additional community college districts, have researched a variety of programs in the systems approach to education, student personnel services, management by objectives, and basic English. These activities have resulted in a series of national workshops for community college personnel on innovative practices held each year (Patterson, 1974, p. 17). The Dayton-Miami Valley Consortium's central office is developing a facility for packaging research to be used by the member institutions. In addition, the DMVC supplies the research and development talent for grant and contract award projects which support the consortium's goals and objectives (DMVC, Procedures, 1974, p. 4).

V. HIGH COST - LOW ENROLLMENT PROGRAMS

A multipurpose service consortium is likely to provide a variety of programs to member institutions. These offerings are programs of high cost and low enrollment which support the philosophical position of the curricular offerings in individual schools. The members support the consortium by supplying basic support through an annual assessment coupled with a schedule of fees for participation in individual programs (Patterson, F., 1974, p. 21).

The Associated Colleges of the Midwest serves its members with multipurpose services. This consortium of twelve liberal arts colleges in the upper Midwest serves to:

"...carry on activities which will enrich the programs of our twelve ACM colleges--activities which probably could not be carried on by one college alone, or for some reason are too specialized to be accomplished on a single campus."
(ACM, 1974, p. 1)

These specialized programs include such activities as off-campus experiences in Arabic Studies, East Asian Studies, Urban Teaching, Argonne Semester, Wilderness Field Station, New York Arts, and the Arts of London and Florence.

Franklin Patterson (1974, p. 97) expressed a need for a consortium-wide degree program to generate a varied educational experience. He expressed the view that a cooperative program could focus a wide variety of faculty and counseling resources into closer contact via the external degree through more classroom experiences, individualized counseling and tutoring, and access to other varied resources. The Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities (UECU) has developed such a program, starting with a Ph.D. program in 1969 and now expanded into a Union Graduate School with over 300 students (The Union, 1975, p. 1). Called the University Without Walls, the program offers an external degree in a highly individualized form of higher education. There are now more than thirty (30) UWW units throughout the country. Another activity for an innovative delivery system was reported by the union to be a high school/

college/UWW program in which students enter the UWW at the end of their junior year in high school. The students work simultaneously toward high school completion and an undergraduate degree. The union views itself as a catalyst for change. The staff seeks to support the ideas and potentials of individual members, while providing developmental grants for the undertaking of experimental efforts by its member institutions (UECU, p. 4).

The Academic Affairs Conference of Midwestern Universities' Chicago Urban Center also provides unique programs for its member institutions. In addition to the Sounds From the People, A Happening in Street Arts, and Portrait of a Slum short-term programs, AACMU offers a long-term Urban Studies Program which:

"...provides a two-month program including class lectures, seminars, and field experiences in the areas of urban renewal, ethnic cultures, political machines, the media, the urban poor, pollution, and other forces shaping urban America. Each student will complete an individual studies project and will work three afternoons per week in a social agency, school, or community organization in Uptown Chicago. Students may receive up to twelve semester hours of credit for the program with tuition determined by the student's home institution." (AACMU, March, 1974).

These examples serve to illustrate the expanded program offerings supported by multipurpose consortia which generate meaningful expensive educational innovations for a minimum of students for institutions at a reduced cost. External financing of administration and developmental costs places these programs in the curriculum of many institutions through interinstitutional cooperation.

VI. SOCIALLY RESPONSIVE COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

Exorbitant costs and disadvantageous geographical locations discourage community services by some elements in higher education. Especially in suburban or metropolitan areas, it is difficult for any one institution to respond to the various regional needs and problems. Through a cooperative system it is possible to combine many individual efforts and resources into an effective instrument

able to speak with a single voice to the community at large and provide effective broad programs. By combining resources, a larger capability is generated for efficient utilization of talent and facilities for funding, staffing, development, and evaluation of community projects.

Lewis Patterson reported a need for consortia to develop the potential of community involvement in his 1970 publication, Consortia in Higher Education (p. 8). Cooperative arrangements were then cited in VISTA activities, student personnel services, cultural activities open to the community, and joint action on governmental resolutions. Since this publication, many consortia have expanded services to the community in many ways. The Ethnic Heritage Studies Program of the Alabama Center for Higher Education sponsors a county association which serves as an advisory committee for the program in addition to developing instructional packets on Afro-American history for use in the cooperating institutions (ACHE, p. 3). This activity serves not only as a community service, but also as a technique to identify educational problems to the community. Activities of this nature may reap future benefits in community support for higher education programs in areas other than just those enumerated (Cheit, pp. 148-149).

Lewis Mayhew (1967, pp. 44-48) stresses the desirability of community support for any educational program and the need to responsively develop community programs as a method to insure a successful total institution. Earl McGrath emphasizes the need to have social needs included in institutional goals and have some mechanism designed to collect input in the formation of these program goals (1970, pp. 96-97). Many institutional members have come to realize that cooperative ventures are an attractive solution to these problems. The Higher Education Coordinating Council of Metropolitan St. Louis performs this service in its geographical area. Representatives of member institutions, in conjunction with citizen advisory groups, have established pilot programs, using consortia funds as a base to generate external funds for projects in student personnel services (Outreach), a low-income neighborhood library, and educational

television program productions (HECC, p. 2). A more complex and far-reaching example of community involvement would be the Dayton-Miami Valley Consortium described earlier in this paper. DMVC has included community action as a paramount goal in its operational charter (DMVC, 1970). As a result, a large percentage of the consortium activities include community elements working in tandem with individual institutions to solve community problems or provide community services. These efforts are a result of undertakings by individual institutions to generate opportunities for community involvement in higher education at policy-making levels to formulate an awareness of the scope and depth of educational problems while serving as a source of information about community needs. The community service function of consortia may be used as a tool to build understanding between the academic and public communities for the mutual benefit of both.

VII. REGIONAL AND AREA PLANNING

Raymond Moore's study (1968, pp. 78-89) was an expanded description of all forms of cooperative actions in higher education. Included in this study were such agencies as accreditation bodies, regional boards, and industrially-related groups. These groups were restricted to a greater degree by the American Association for Higher Education (1974) into broader categories according to purpose. Interstate compacts, state associations, accrediting agencies, national associations, and international cooperatives were listed according to specialized function. These cooperatives served as a form of planning and administrative control for individual institutions, but were not included in the study because of the semi-obligatory nature of the associations.

Planning and administrative efforts of consortia as restricted and defined by Lewis Patterson's 1973 directory were as widespread and as varied as the arrangements themselves. The many efforts to manage and plan resource

utilization and generate new resources are evident from the variety of samples illustrated in the many listings.

A planning and management program is considered to have four basic components: trained decision-makers, analysts, analytic tools, and operational data bases. Such programs are useless unless decision-makers shape the program and all are trained and committed to use the resulting program. Any improvement in planning or management does not come from the results of a single encounter with the program, but from the continuous application of these theories by the decision-makers (Farmer, 1971, p. 5). Effective programs for administration and planning result from the generally stated goal of more effective utilization of physical and personnel resources in conjunction with economy of operations. This has resulted in a wide vista of cooperative ventures in planning and management.

The element of training decision-makers materializes in joint workshops and training seminars (ACM, THE, DMVC, GLCA, WCHE) to develop common approaches through the shared expertise of all member institutions and external experts. These are conducted on a regular basis in several of the consortia (GLCA, THE, ACM), while special problem seminars are conducted by other groups (DMVC, WCHE). The training function comes from group interaction of "on-line" administrators in relation to a real problem situation. The Associated Colleges of the Midwest provides information and training to its member institutions for the writing of federal grant applications. Administrative talent is shared for any identified special program in the Central Pennsylvania Consortium, resulting in a reduced administrative budget. Coordination of administrative and planning efforts for individual members of the Consortium for Continuing Education in Northern Virginia includes funding research, evaluation of programs, interinstitutional research services, and service as an overall source of information about adult education for all member institutions. Work seminars are

conducted on a regular basis to provide leadership in continuing administrative tasks, as well as guidance for special projects and programs (THE, 1974).

The management analysts are developed along with analytical tools in many ways. For planning and management, new techniques are developed using old procedures; new procedures are developed using old techniques. A variety of new concepts are periodically introduced, which require training or research into applications for higher education. GT/70 is an excellent example of the many ways in which consortia serve these purposes:

"The purpose of GT/70 is to foster cooperative relationships among its member institutions and between its membership and other agencies. Such cooperation seeks to deal with current problems facing the membership, assess future national instructional needs and trends, and increase the diffusion rate of productive innovation on member campuses." (1973 Consortium Directory, pp. 17-18)

Programs developed to achieve this purpose are workshops in instructional media, student services curriculum development, and management. One technique used to present this information is a videotape delivery system, used to instruct workshop participants using only one presentation. This system also provides a daily video report about current management activities among member institutional administrators (GT/70, p. 4).

By providing these services, an operational data base is established for joint and cooperative planning. Fred F. Harclerod (Boyd, pp. 34-35), provides a model for a coordinating agency which applies equally well to consortia information systems. This model requires extensive mutual planning, policy development, program development, and master planning for joint ventures. Consortia programs must be funded sufficiently to insure completion of master plan objectives by the use of consistent guidelines in all institutions. Constant appraisal and evaluation of institutional objectives must be accomplished to insure application of master plan guidelines. Central administrators must be able and willing to provide advice as needed and requested to individual institutions for implementation of systemwide policies and programs. This model

assumes that a sufficient data base is available to provide information as needed. Any decision must be based upon the most accurate and complete information available. This lets the administrator examine alternative solutions and then decide the avenue most beneficial to his situation.

Several consortia have developed various types of information systems. Some are more specific than others. Student cross-registration and recruitment activities require an information pool be established, then disseminated to the various elements as practiced by ACM and GLCA. Mutual fund-raising creates the need for accurate financial information. This element in cooperation is practiced by WCHE and VECU. Information delivery systems are in use by GT/70 and HECC which provide exchanges of information about occurrences in shared programs. In well-organized cooperatives, the information and management systems are well-developed and operate to maximum efficiency. The well-planned and managed system serves to support successful programs and activities.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The information gleaned from this examination of cooperative arrangements has indicated that rapid changes are occurring in higher education--changes resulting not only from financial pressures but also from social and governmental influences. Funding sources have evolved from limited contributions of member institutions to governmental grants. High costs have forced many institutions to ignore autonomy in favor of shared facilities and faculties. Rapidly inflating costs have forced specialized programs to become mutual ventures in order to protect educational offerings. Social demands for educational services and changes in programs have generated a need to share expertise and resources to satisfy these demands. Finally, generally limited resources are resulting in joint administration and management functions via cooperative activities. These have resulted from a true concern by higher educational institutions to preserve and expand educational offerings to the consumer of educational services--student and society.

APPENDIX A

STUDY SAMPLE

- *Academic Affairs Conference of Midwestern Universities
- *Alabama Center for Higher Education, Inc.
- *American Association for Higher Education (Cooperative Progress)
- *Associated Colleges of the Midwest
- *Association for Colleges and Universities for International-Intercultural Study, Inc.
 - Boston Theological Institute
- *Central Pennsylvania Consortium
 - Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, Inc.
 - College Center of the Finger Lakes
- *Consortium for Continuing Higher Education in Northern Virginia
- Council of Higher Educational Institutions in New York City
- *Council for Intercultural Studies and Programs
- *Dayton-Miami Valley Consortium, Inc.
- *East Central College Consortium
- *Great Lakes Colleges Association, Inc.
- *GT/70 (Group Ten Community Colleges for the Seventies)
 - Higher Education Coordinating Council of Metropolitan St. Louis, Inc.
 - Inter-University Institute of Engineering Control
 - Lake Superior Association of Colleges and Universities
- *League for Innovation in the Community College
- Northeast Florida Cooperative Education Consortium
- Oregon Independent Colleges Association, Inc.
- Regional Council for International Education
- Southwest Alliance for Latin America
- Texan Association of Developing Colleges
- Twin Cities Inter-College Cooperation
- *Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities
 - Union of Independent Colleges of Art, Inc.
 - Western Kansas Community Services Consortium
- *Worcester Consortium for Higher Education, Inc.

*Denotes participation

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Academic Affairs Conference of Midwestern Universities. Newsletter. 3:1, September, 1974.

Academic Consortia for Higher Education. Acquainter. Volume 7:8, November-December, 1974.

Alabama Center for Higher Education. Ethnic Heritage Studies Program Narrative. Birmingham, Alabama: The Center, February, 1975.

American Association for Higher Education. Guide to Interinstitutional Arrangements: Voluntary and Statutory. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1974.

Associated Colleges of the Midwest. Program Offerings, 1974-75. Chicago: The Association, May, 1974.

_____. Together, 1974-75. Chicago: The Association, May, 1974.

Association of Colleges and Universities for International-Intercultural Studies, Inc. ACUIIS: Annual Report of the Executive Director, 1973. Nashville, Tennessee: The Association, 1973.

_____. ACUIIS Faculty Seminar in Tunisia and Egypt. Nashville, Tennessee: The Association, August, 1975.

_____. Bylaws and Articles of Incorporation. Nashville, Tennessee: The Association, October 26, 1973.

_____. The Graz Center. Nashville, Tennessee: The Association, February, 1975.

Boyd, J.D.; A.D. Browne; F.F. Harclerod; and Ben Lawrence. Comprehensive Information Systems for Statewide Planning in Higher Education. Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program Report Two (Proceedings of an invitational seminar for chancellors and executive directors of state commissions and boards of higher education), June, 1970.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Higher Education: Who Pays? Who Benefits? Who Should Pay? New York: McGraw-Hill (for the Commission), 1973.

Central Pennsylvania Consortium. The Central Pennsylvania Consortium: An Organizational Overview. Gettysburg, Pennsylvania: The Consortium, Fall, 1974.

Cheit, Earl F. The New Depression in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill (for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education), 1971.

Consortium for Continuing Education in Northern Virginia. Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws. Fairfax, Virginia: The Consortium, 1972.

_____. Continuing Education for Northern Virginia. Volume 2:3. September, 1974.

Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area. Articles of Incorporation. Filed with the Recorder of Deeds, Washington, D.C., December, 1967.

Council for Intercultural Studies and Programs. Newsletter. January, 1975.

Dayton-Miami Valley Consortium. The Dayton-Miami Valley Consortium Constitution. Dayton, Ohio: The Consortium, November 9, 1970.

_____. Educational Opportunity Center. Dayton, Ohio: The Consortium, Fall, 1974.

_____. Procedure Manual. Dayton, Ohio: The Consortium, June 19, 1974.

_____. Student Cross-Registration Policy and Procedures. Dayton, Ohio: The Consortium, January, 1975.

Diener, T.J. and L.D. Patterson (eds.). Trends and Issues in Cooperation. Consortium Seminar Proceedings, Fall, 1973. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Dwyer, Claudette and Lewis D. Patterson (eds.). Institutional Interface: Making the Right Connection. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1974.

East Central College Consortium. Non-Traditional Study Program. Alliance, Ohio: The Consortium, Fall, 1974.

Farmer, James. An Approach to Planning and Management Systems Implementation. Los Angeles, California: California State Colleges (WICHE/PMS Program), 1971.

GT/70. Colleges in Transition. 4:3, February, 1975.

Gilligan, John J. "Preserving a National Resource," New York Times. October 9, 1974.

Great Lakes College Association. Faculty Development Report 1. Ann Arbor: The Association, January, 1975.

_____. An Introduction to the Great Lakes College Association. Ann Arbor: The Association, September, 1974.

_____. Organizational Sketch: The Great Lakes College Association. Ann Arbor: The Association, October, 1974.

Harclerod, F.F. (ed.). Higher Education: A Developing Field of Study. Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program (for the Association of Professors of Higher Education), 1974.

Higher Education Coordinating Council of Metropolitan St. Louis. Newsletter, '74. St. Louis: The Council, October, 1974.

Independent College Funds of America. State Associations of Privately Supported Colleges and Universities. New York: ICFA, 1972.

Lahti, Robert E. Innovative College Management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Letter, Sidney S. (ed.). New Prospects for the Small Liberal Arts College. New York: Colombia University (for the Institute of Higher Education), 1968.

Martorana, S.V.; J.C. Messersmith; and L.O. Nelson. Cooperative Projects Among Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, 1961.

Mayhew, Lewis B. Contemporary College Students and the Curriculum. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board (SREB Research Monograph No. 14), 1969.

McGrath, Earl J. (ed.). Selected Issues in College Administration. New York: Columbia University (for the Institute of Higher Education), 1967.

Moore, Raymond S. "Interinstitutional Cooperation," New Prospects for the Small, Liberal Arts College. Sidney S. Letter (ed.). New York: Colombia University (for the Institute of Higher Education), 1968. pp. 73-89.

O'Neil, June (ed.). Resource Use in Higher Education. Berkeley, California: The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1971.

Orwig, M.D. (ed.). Financing Higher Education: Alternatives for the Federal Government. Iowa City, Iowa: The American College Testing Program Monograph Five, 1971.

Patterson, Franklin. Colleges in Consort. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Patterson, L.D. (ed.). Consortia in American Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse of Higher Education, Report 7, 1970.

_____. Consortia: 1974. Personal notes from author for the current consortia directory, updated to January 1, 1975.

_____. 1973 Consortium Directory. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1973.

Peterson, Marvin W. and John S. Waggett. Interinstitutional Cooperation in Doctoral Education: A Report With Recommendations. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, Center for the Study of Higher Education, September, 1972.

Schwenkmeyer, Barry and Mary E. Goodman. Putting Cooperation to Work. Washington, D.C.: Management Division, Academy for Education Development, Inc., 1972.

Shulman, Carol H. Private Colleges: Present Conditions and Future Prospects. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Report 9, 1974.

Trivett, David A. Goals for Higher Education: Definitions and Directions. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Report 6, 1973.

Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities. History and Activities of the Union. Yellow Springs, Ohio: The Union, 1975.

West, Elmer D. The Consortium. A speech presented to the Washington Society of Mechanical Engineers, April 27, 1967.

_____. The Formation of a Consortium. From the Proceedings of the Joint Educational-Industrial-Governmental Science Symposium, March 12, 1970.

_____. Why Joint Action? A speech presented at the 8th Annual Conference of the Philadelphia Commission on Higher Education, November 23, 1965.

Worcester Consortium for Higher Education, Inc. Consortium Report. Worcester, Massachusetts: The Consortium, January, 1975.

_____. An Introduction to WCHE. Worcester, Massachusetts: The Consortium, Fall, 1974.